

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-17, 19-22, and 25 are pending. Claims 1-5, 9, 10, 13-17, 21, 22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Montulli in view of Deaton. Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, 19, 20, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Montulli in view of Deaton and further in view of Official Notice. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-17, 19-22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and claims 2-12 and 14-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Regarding the priority date of the present case, the independent claims have been amended to remove the term ‘purchase’ from the claims. While Applicants believe that the term is indeed supported by the instant Specification, the term is being removed to put the case in a better position for allowance. Additionally, the independent claims have been amended to clarify that the Transaction ID is associated with an entry in the online database. With these amendments, it is believed that the claims are entitled to the priority of the earliest filed parent case of Dec. 14, 1995. Reconsideration of the priority claim is respectfully requested.

It is also believed that the present amendments will also obviate the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejection. Reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection, Applicants are not sure how to respond as the Examiner has not requested or suggested a correction for the term ‘mini-homepage’. Applicants note that the end result of the present invention is indeed a web page that is presented to the user and others over the Internet. The

Undersigned and Mr. Wesinger explained to the Examiner during the interview that the page is generated as a result of the HTML-front end processes disclosed in the Specification that automatically and seamlessly interacts with the online database in a manner transparent to the user. Should the Examiner require any further clarification, he is invited to contact the Undersigned at any time.

Moving to the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Montulli in view of Deaton, it is believed that the claims are clearly distinguishable over the cited art.

The Examiner has cited Montulli for the Transaction ID term. However, Applicants fail to see a Transaction ID in Montulli that provides the functionality of this disclosure. Rather, the section of Montulli cited discloses the use of cookies transmitted to the user's computer the purchase process. Additionally, the Examiner has stated that moving a Transaction ID to an online database is an obvious rearrangement of parts. Applicants respectfully disagree with such a reading of Montulli.

The Examiner is reminded that at the time of the filing of the parent case in 1995, such an arrangement was not routine. Applicants wish to direct the Examiner's attention the Background section of the Specification, where problems in the art at the time of the filing of the parent case are explained. In 1995, there existed no easy manner in which to publish and update information on the Internet. In fact, the most common way to publish information was to fax or email information to an intermediary, such as an ISP, who would then publish the information. The problems associated with this process are detailed in the Background section.

The present invention solves these problems by allowing a user to create an entry, add content, and subsequently update the entry, all through an automated process. Key to

this process is the Transaction ID. The ability to store and retrieve the various information and content provided by a user, and the ability to associate this with a particular entry is provided by the functionality of the Transaction ID. This is different than the use of cookies, which typically are used to collect information. Rather, the Transaction ID is the “glue” that ties together the entry, its content, and information about the entry and its owner, such as user and financial information. Applicants thus believe that the process as claimed is therefore a significant advance over the state of the art in 1995, and request reconsideration for this reason.

The proposed combination of Montulli and Deaton further illustrate the novelty of the present case. Applicants note that Montulli is directed towards an online shopping system that displays information posted by a merchant for browsing by a customer (*See* the Summary at Col. 2, line 55). The database of Deaton is not accessible nor modifiable by a user over the Internet, rather content is added by the transaction terminals that read checks (*See* Col. 4, line 16). Neither reference alone or in combination provide for the creation and subsequent updating of a mini-homepage as claimed. Indeed, both references would have to be improperly modified beyond their central purpose to arrive at the present claims and provide the benefits as described.

The Examiner has also stated that the content of the mini-homepage is merely subjective. It should now be appreciated that this is not the case as the content of the mini-homepage is provided by the user for publishing on the Internet, and this content is organized in part by the Transaction ID. It is respectfully submitted that neither Montulli nor Deaton teach or suggest the creation of an entry with an associated Transaction ID that results in a personal homepage displaying the user’s content as now claimed. Thus,

Applicants respectfully submit that the limitations of the claims, including the dependent claims, indeed represent important functionality not available in 1995.

The Examiner has taken Official Notice that it was well-known in the art to allow a user to update information over the Internet. Applicants respectfully traverse this finding. As mentioned in the Background section of the instant Specification, users could not directly update information on a web site in 1995. Rather, proposed edits or changes were typically sent to a third party, who then implemented the changes, resulting in the problems solved by the present invention. The Examiner is asked to provide any factual basis to the contrary relied upon for his finding.

Regarding the Official Notice of the previous Office Action, Applicants did not choose to traverse the Examiner's finding at that time because the purpose of Applicants' previous response was to introduce amendments in light of the interview. During the interview, the Examiner was very gracious and it was believed some of the same issues raised in this Final Office Action were to be solved by the previous amendments. As it was believed that an agreement in principle was reached during the interview, a point-by-point traversal of each and every rejection was not deemed necessary as it was believed allowable subject matter had been identified. Thus, the content of Applicants' previous response were directed towards pointing out how the claims were being amended and summarizing the interview. However, in light of this Final Office Action, the Examiner's Official Notice findings are hereby traversed.

Reconsideration and allowance of this case is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application or this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 775-848-5624.

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: December 15, 2006

/timothy a. brisson/

Timothy A. Brisson
Reg. No.: 44,046

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
1657 Hwy 395, Suite 202
Minden, NV 89423
(775) 586-9500